

FILE COPY

MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Select Committee on Proposed Budget Cuts at the University of Missouri-Columbia

MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Select Committee on Proposed Budget Cuts at the University of Missouri - Columbia

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER

Gary D. Sharpe, Co-Chairman Winnie P. Weber, Co-Chairman Everett Brown Deverne Calloway Estil Fretwell W. A. (Bill) Markland Annette Morgan Travis Morrison John A. Sharp Curtis Wilkerson

Staff Assistance:

Anne Walker, Research Analyst

Missouri House of Representatives

Jefferson City Office:

Room 402, Capitol Bldg. Jefferson City, MO 65101 Phone: 314/751-4425

Hannibal Office:

Court House 906 Broadway Hannibal, MO 63401 Phone: 314/221-3151

Home:

3305 Pershing Avenue Hannibal, MO 63401 Phone: 314/221-7971

GARY D. SHARPE Representative 13th Legislative District

June 14, 1982

Chairman:

Elementary & Secondary Education

Member:

Appropriations - Education & Transportation Revenue & Economics Miscellaneous Resolutions

House Delegate:

Education Commission of the States



The Honorable Bob F. Griffin Speaker Missouri House of Representatives Jefferson City, Missouri

Dear Mr. Speaker:

In your letter establishing the select committee, you asked us to study the potential impact upon the State of Missouri of the proposed cuts in programs at the University of Missouri-Columbia. Within the limited time available to us, we have done that.

There follows herewith a report of the committee's findings and recommendations. If it meets with your approval, we ask that it be forwarded to the Board of Curators and to other interested parties in the University and elsewhere.

As the committee was assembling this report, Chancellor Barbara Uehling released a statement indicating the entire reduction proposal process has been suspended for the present, and recommends that the entire university system initiate overall review and evaluation of programs to meet the stated objectives of the university administrators, (i.e. - reduce the scope of programs thereby generating revenue for increased faculty salaries).

Simeerely,

ARY D' SHARPE

WINNIE D WEBER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I	OVERVIEW	1
II	SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY	2
	Administration Coordinating Board of Higher Education School of Medicine and Nursing School of Library and Information Science College of Engineering College of Home Economics College of Public and Community Service College of Education Uniform Concerns	
III	FINDINGS	10
IV	RECOMMENDATIONS	12

I. OVERVIEW:

The legislature is responsible for appropriating funds from general revenue to the University of Missouri. The Board of Curators of the university in turn allocates funds to each of the colleges within the university, thereby establishing the budget picture for the entire university system. Over the last two fiscal years, funds have been withheld from the university due to the financial situation of the state. Two years ago three percent was withheld and last year the Governor withheld ten percent of the funds appropriated for the university. State appropriation figures for FY 1982 were set at \$170,239,954. The ten percent withholding equaled \$17,023,995 leaving an available appropriation for FY 1983 of \$153,215,959. The recommended appropriation for FY 1983 is \$170,765,700, an increase of \$17,549,741 from available funds in Fy 1982. This demonstrates a 11.5% increase over available funds for FY 1982.

Currently, the university is engaged in review and evaluation of its programs for the purpose of budget development for its four campuses. The University of Missouri-Columbia is underway in their process of determining where budget reductions and reallocation can occur. Recommendations have been developed by the Provost. Subsequent recommendations have been offered by the Advisory Committee on Program Reductions. Following the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the chancellor and other chief administrators will present a proposal to the Board of Curators. The Board of Curators, in turn, will make the final decision in this process.

The hearings held by the committee occurred between release of the Provost's recommendations and the formal release of the Advisory Committee's recommendations. Subsequent to the hearings, reactions of various members of the Board of Curators were reported by the press.

The committee recognizes that their information, reactions and the following report was produced at a point in the middle of the budget development process.

The committee's purpose was to study all proposed cuts and their impact upon the state of Missouri. Many affected schools and colleges within the university train students in professions that are service oriented and which are vital to the well-being of the people of Missouri. Thus, the proposed budget cuts and the retrenchment strategy of the university have become a matter which relates to and affects public policy of the State of Missouri.

II SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY:

On May 12 and May 19, the committee held hearings in Jefferson City. Dr. James C. Olson, President of the University of Missouri, Dr. Barbara S. Uehling, Chancellor of the Columbia Campus, Dr. Ronald F. Bunn, Provost of the Columbia Campus presented the administration's positions on the proposed budget reductions at the university. Deans from the affected areas also provided the committee with information on their colleges, schools and departments. Other witnesses included the Commissioner of Education and the Executive Director of the Coordinating Board of Higher Education.

Administration

The University of Missouri has for several years struggled to stretch its resources to meet new demands; teaching more and more students while coping with significant losses in purchasing power because of inflation. State appropriations for the university have risen steadily, but have not enabled the university to keep up with inflation.

Over the last ten years the university had added forty-five new degree programs, full campus enrollment has grown by nearly seventeen percent and real dollar support as measured by the consumer price index has fallen by almost twenty-one million dollars. The university's annual operating budget has for several years been developed by extracting amounts from the prior year's base budget to combine with new revenue in order to meet mandatory costs. The administration feels this process of reallocating from the base budget for new costs has caused all programs to move toward mediocrity or worse.

The guiding principle of the administration in planning is to maintain quality, even if that means to do less. Thus, the proposed "vertical" budget reductions have been proposed. The university is attempting to develop a plan that will meet financial uncertainties and allow continuation of quality instruction and salary increases at the state's major research institution. The Provost has announced a tentative plan of vertical reductions.

The much publicized rating system was developed as a way to bring about an assessment of each of the schools and colleges in terms of four sets of considerations. These are quality, mission, cost effectiveness, need or demand. The administration recognizes the almost impossible task of assigning a mathematically precise equation to these criteria and their inability to accurately get the shading of interpretations and importance relative of one program to the other.

The Missouri Constitution, Article IX, Section 9(a), regarding the state's university, says...."The government of the State

University shall be vested in a board of curators...". The ultimate decision regarding budget reduction or program elimination thus rests with the curators.

The Coordinating Board of Higher Education became involved in this issue when several members of the board were contacted by interested groups whose programs or activities would be affected by proposed reductions at the University of Missouri-Columbia. These same board members in turn contacted the executive director of the coordinating board and recommended the board prepare a paper outlining the board's own responsibility in this particular matter.

Statutorily, the coordinating board is charged with
"Recommending to the governing board of any institution of higher education in the state the development, consolidation or elimination of programs, degree offerings, physical facilities or policy changes where that action is deemed by the coordinating board as in the best interest of the institutions themselves and/or the general requirements of the state. Recommendations shall be submitted to governing boards by twelve months preceding the term in which the action may take effect." (Section 173.030.2 RSMo)

The coordinating board has not made any recommendations regarding the review process and the proposed cuts, nor was the board consulted about the proposal. The board is and regularly does prepare a plan that reflects the higher education needs of the state. The current plan, Master Plan III, is being adjusted to reflect 1980 statistics and should be ready by June of 1983. The coordinating board has recommended the retrenchment process to all of the state's higher education facilities.

Specific Problems

The School of Medicine's proposed budget reduction of \$325,000 was actually a reallocation represented by cuts mandated last fall.

An internal committee at the medical school identified the areas of reduction last fall, unlike many colleges and schools which now must face cutting to fall within the proposed reductions. Eliminated within the school of medicine will be medical dietetics, radiologic technology and respiratory therapy. These programs are part of the school of Health Related Professions. The School of Nursing's budget would be reduced over three years by \$500,000. The nursing savings would be available for campus-wide use.

The School of Library and Information Science. The administration proposed complete elimination of the school, thus saving some \$526,000 for campus-wide use. The elimination is to be phased in over three years.

The school is the <u>only</u> accredited school for information professionals in the state and one of only two in all Big 8

Page 4

schools. The school provides not only training for library and information professionals but also research training and resources for undergraduates and graduate students within other colleges. Nationally, over fifty percent of the gross national product is accounted for by people in the area of information, a growing percentage in this age of technology.

The College of Engineering. The administration proposed to reduce the scope of the program and possible elimination of the Department of Industrial Engineering. This elimination and reduction of scope would generate \$400,000 for the College of Engineering to use, and would be by review of the college and phased in over three years.

The Department of Industrial Engineering is one of only two such engineering departments in the state. Missouri ranks second in industrial manufacturing in the region consisting of its eight bordering states. Additionally, the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education project industrial engineering to be the only engineering discipline to have a long term shortage. There will only be 48,000 B.S. graduates available in 1990 to fill a predicted 94,000 job openings.

The College of Home Economics faced a reduction in scope and possible elimination of the Department of Housing and Interior Design and the Department of Clothing and Textiles. It is anticipated this would produce \$520,000 for campus-wide use and would be accomplished by a review of the college and phased in over three years.

Home economics units were included in the land grant colleges by the 1870's through specific inclusion in the enabling legislation. This field has traditionally been populated by a high percentage of women. Ninety-two percent of the college's enrollment is female and seventy-eight percent of its faculty is female. The college views its role as central to the people of the state. Research, education, advocacy, and consumer service in the areas of food, clothing, shelter, human development, and family financial management will remain central needs of the families of the state.

The College of Public and Community Service. The administration's proposal was elimination of all programs or elimination of all programs except the Master of Social Work. This would produce \$1,100,000 for campus-wide use (\$750,000 if MSW retained) and is scheduled to be phased in over three years. The College of Public and Community Services includes the Department of Recreation and Park Administration, Community Development and Social Work. The Department of Recreation and Park Administration is the only accredited program within the state schools of higher education and was the second such program in the nation to receive accreditation from the National Council on Accreditation. Additionally, the economy of Missouri is heavily focused on leisure, with tourism being the state's third largest industry.

The School of Social Work provides training for many employees of the state's service agencies. There are six BSW programs state-wide. The University of Missouri-Columbia is the largest program and in the past three years has produced one-third of all BSW graduates in Missouri.

The Department of Community Development is service oriented. A community development professional works with the community groups and organizations to the end that they are mature, healthy entities in their physical, social, political and institutional life. Communities must respond at an increasing level to solving their own problems in financially austere times of program cuts and lack of continued government funding for many community services.

The College of Education's proposed budget reduction was the largest. Recommended action was to reduce the scope of programs along with redefining the purpose, with emphasis on graduate degree programs. A limited high-quality undergraduate program was recommended to be retained. Substantial reductions were recommended within the Health and Physical Education programs. This would produce \$1,200,000 for campus-wide use and would be accomplished through college review with outside consultation and phased in over three years.

Witnesses told the committee that the loss of the university as a teacher training institute would result in the loss of approximately 500 teachers per year, and this at a time when the state's public education system can least afford it. Since 1945, the University of Missouri-Columbia has been the number one preparation point for teachers. 16,759 certificated teachers have been produced from 1945 to 1981. Since 1977, the last five years, teacher production state-wide has decreased from 4,608 to 3,423. As teacher production decreases, the number of temporary certificates that the state issues increases.

Additionally, teachers in the age group of 25 to 39 are leaving the teaching field at an increased pace as evidenced by the number of persons withdrawing their funds from teacher retirement. During the first six months of 1981, 3,480 people withdrew their funds.

Regarding the impact on supply of certified teachers to the public schools, the following facts were identifiable:

1. Over the last five years the number of temporary certificates issued has risen from 3,025 in 1977 to 4,888 in 1981.

- 2. The number of teachers leaving teaching as indicated by withdrawing retirement benefits has increased steadily over the last several years from 4,039 in 1975 to 5,146 in 1980-81.
- 3. In the chart following, the data indicates fields where demand for teachers exceeds supply.

(See chart on following page)

Teacher Supply and Demand Index November 1981 ,

	A			3	
		1	2	Index of	(+) (-)
Rank	Teaching Field	Supply	Demand	Demand	From 1980
1.	Physics	3	25	8.33	+ 6.16
	Earth Science	.11	46	4.18	+ .92
3.	German	· 4	10	2.5	+ 1.21
4.	Guidance .	53	132	. 2.49 .	+ 1.49
	Library Science	27 .	65	2.41	- 1.09
6.	Math	. 95	215	2.26	97
	Industrial Ed.	-65	119	1.83	÷39
8-	Jr. High Science	39	70	1.79	38
	Driver's Ed	14	24	1.71	+ .78
	English	171	280	1.64	+ .60
	Chemistry	32	. 48	1.5	67
	Speech Correction	70	95	1.36	+ .36
	Spanish	31	· 37	1.19	03
14-	Deaf and Hard of Hearing	15	16	1.07	61
	Speech and Drama	40	41	1.03	÷ .28
	Ortho-Handicapped .	13	13	1.0	
17.	_	121	121	1.0	+ .04
	French	22	22	1.0	10
50 A 10 A	Home Ec.	88	87	.99	10
2000	Agriculture	45	39	.87	47
	Music	228	194 .	.85	01
	Social Studies	225	184	. 82	÷ .15
23.	Learning Disabilities	205	168	.82	42
	Biology	78	63	.81	01
25.	Journalism	45	35	€78	+ .14
26.	Behavioral Disorders	112	79	.71	10
27.	Business Ed.	135	80	.59	+ .08
28.	Elementary Ed.	1354	781	.58	24
29.	Men's P.E.	216	117	.54	+ .17
30.	Educ. Mentally Retarded	233	125	.54	46
	Remedial Reading	148	78	.53	05
	Early Childhood	60	29	.48	+ .32
	Women's P.E.	178	71	. 40	_ + .03
	Latin	0	2		

Supply represents close to 100% of new teachers trained in Missouri in 1980-81. This information was supplied by Missouri teacher training institutions.

~

Demand represents the number of positions open due to teachers leaving the profession, increased enrollment and new programs. This information was supplied by Missouri public school districts.

Page 8

The university of Missouri-Columbia undergraduate teacher education program ranges from superior to unique in the following areas:

- (a) Agricultural education
- (b) Journalism education
- (c) Special education
- (d) Industrial Arts education
- (e) Teacher placement (In the past ten years the College of Education has not placed fewer than ninety-five percent of its B. S. in Education graduates seeking employment as a teacher)

Uniform Concerns:

Witnesses expressed concern that there appears to exist an affirmative action impact to the proposed reductions. The targeted areas are and have traditionally been occupied by women and minorities. They have been successful in the job market within these traditional areas. The suggestion by the administration that they be counseled into non-traditional fields supports this concern.

Common to many sections of the university were problems associated with the rating system, the subjectiveness of that system and definition of terms. There also appear to be problems associated with tenure, and faculty and student morale.

While the climate exists for academic freedom to criticize the administration's proposals, many witnesses emphasized the divisiveness and the fear of retribution of a negative response.

Tenured faculty comprised a large portion of the college of education's faculty as well as other colleges. Legal difficulties could result if the current proposals were enacted. The administration had not, at the time of the hearing, resolved this problem and had suggested that the deans of such areas come up with a solution to the tenure problem. A tenured faculty member can only be terminated if all programs that he or she is associated with are eliminated. In the College of Education for instance, many faculty members teach undergraduate and graduate courses. To follow the reduction plan and eliminate the undergraduate teacher education program would only reduce the tenured faculties' teaching load, not terminate all programs they are associated with.

All affected groups expressed dissatisfaction with the rating system.

The administration was criticized for its handling of the publicity surrounding the proposal, the lack of long range planning and failure to involve the coordinating board of higher education.

The failure to mention this proposal during the course of the legislative appropriations hearings and the poor morale that has been created among faculty and students also were highlighted.

III FINDINGS:

- 1. Communication between the University and the General Assembly regarding need and goals was faulty.
- 2. The contact and communication on campus between deans of the areas affected by the proposed cuts and the chief administrators was poor.
- 3. The public's perception was that the proposed cuts were an administrative mandate rather than proposals resulting from overall evaluation and review by the university community. Despite statements by the chief administrators of the University that the intent of the process was to develop proposed cuts from a general review of all programs, there was a strong consensus among members of the committee that the proposed cuts were preconceived by the administration.
- 4. There is no evidence that the University of Missouri-Columbia had or attempted to coordinate its review process with the overall needs of the state as preceived by the Coordinating Board of Higher Education or other universities within the state system.
- 5. Additionally, there was no evidence that the same degree of scrutiny was applied by the University of Missouri-Columbia administrators to other campuses within the system.
- 6. It is the general feeling of the committee that the rating system which became highly publicized as the instrument for identifying programs targeted for reduction or reallocation, was highly subjective rather than being a reliable and valid instrument of measurement.
- 7. No attempt was made by administrators to justify the weighting given individual aspects of the rating system.

Although the committee has not had sufficient time to do independent research on the impact of the proposed cuts on training of professionals vital to public needs, it believes that the need has been inadequately estimated and underweighted in some areas, notably in the training of teachers and the development of professionals in the fields of parks and recreations and library science. Evidence did support the following additional findings:

- a. Teacher shortages in certain academic areas, specifically mathematics, science and industrial education do exist.
- b. The proposed elimination of the department of Recreation and Park Administration is not consistent with the overall industrial

development goals in a state which ranks tourism as its third largest industry. The committee feels that the maintenance of a strong state parks system is a vital part of that tourism industry and necessitates the training of competent professionals in Recreation and Park Administration.

c. During a period of time when reliance on information systems and data retrieval capabilities are greatly in demand, it seems illogical to the committee to consider elimination of the state's only university program offering specific training in library and information sciences.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. The committee recommends a delay of all actions until the Coordinating Board of Higher Education has completed their review of the higher education needs of Missouri and finalized Master Plan III, thus offering recommendations for all of Missouri's universities and colleges based on adequate study and coordination.
- 2. The committee further recommends that at the time Master Plan III (for all university systems within the state) is completed, formal recommendations for program modifications from the Coordinating Board should be presented to the General Assembly and specifically to the appropriation committee of each chamber.
- 3. The committee recommends the University of Missouri-Columbia and any other campus within the University of Missouri system or any other university in the state, desiring to modify their campus programs, whether it be to expand existing programs or reduce or eliminate existing programs and degree offerings, utilize the following procedure:
 - A. Formally communicate with the Coordinating Board regarding the objectives of the University so that the Board may evaluate and respond to these objectives with regard to the appropriate Master Plan for higher education of the state. Such formal communication should be an integral part of the evaluation process and initiated at the outset of planning by any university.
 - B. Communicate with the General Assembly, specifically through the appropriation process, regarding program objectives of the university.
 - C. With regard to program evaluation and review, the committee recommends that each university should clearly delineate if recommendations are to come from a democratic process involving a broad basis of personnel within the university community or is to be initiated by the university board and chief administrators. In the case of the proposed cuts for the University of Missouri-Columbia, this delineation was not clear and as a result was responsible for confusion, uncertainty and ultimately the lowering of morale among certain groups of campus faculty.

There is some committee sentiment that recommendations for program modifications originate only from a democratic process involving a broad base of personnel within the university community as well as some representatives from out-side the university community. In line with this expression of feelings on the part of some committee members, would be the Chancellor's recommendation for a state-wide blue ribbon panel to examine and develop a statement regarding the mission of the University of Missouri for the remainder of this century.

- D. The committee recommends that special efforts should be exerted to hold harmless programs developed or expanded because of a policy commitment to affirmative action for groups protected by laws against discriminatory practices; (i.e. women, blacks, and handicapped).
- 4. It is the feeling of the committee that the preparation of a sufficient quantity of well qualified individuals to teach in Missouri's public schools should be central to the mission of Missouri's universities and colleges. Therefore, the committee recommends that no further efforts be directed toward major reductions or elimination of teacher education programs except as an outgrowth of planning by the Coordinating Board which takes into consideration the specific resources and unique features of individual universities within the system.

If and when recommendations for modiciation of teacher education programs are made by the Coordinating Board, these recommendations should address state-wide needs and should include directives to all Missouri universities and colleges so that there is an assurance to the citizens of the state that the critical need for public school teachers in both quantity and quality is met.